



PTO/SB92 (08-00)

Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0651-0031

U. S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it contains a valid OMB control number.

### Certificate of Mailing under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence\* is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

**Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231**

on April 29, 2003

Date

Signature


**Robert L. McKellar**

Typed or printed name of person of signing Certificate

Note: Each paper must have its own certificate of mailing, or this certificate must identify each submitted paper.

\* Response under 37 CFR 1.111 for USSN 09/954,528, filed September 17, 2001 in the name of Michael John Watson with Attorney Docket Number DC - 4952, consisting of Response, Remarks of 3 pages, amendments to the specification cover letter, pages 1 and 7 of the amended specification, cover letter for amendment of the claims, 1 page of amended claims, Cover letter for amended abstract, amended abstract page, Cover letter for amendment of the drawings, 1 page of amended Figure 9, 1 page of status of claims. Return receipt postcard.

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 0.03 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U. S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.



28pH 2827  
IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of:

Michael John Watson

Serial Number 09/954,528

Filed: September 17, 2001

Title: IMPROVED ADHESIVES FOR  
SEMICONDUCTOR APPLICA-  
TIONS EFFICIENT PROCESSES  
FOR PRODUCING SUCH  
DEVICES AND THE DEVICE  
PER SE PRODUCED BY THE  
EFFICIENT PROCESSES

Attorney Docket: DC - 4952

Group Art Unit: 2827

Examiner: Chambliss

Response Under Rule  
37 CFR 1.111

April 28, 2003

Assistant Commissioner  
For Patents  
Washington DC 20231

Dear Sir:

This is a response to the Office Action mailed on February 4, 2003.

Enclosed are separate pages entitled:

REMARKS  
AMENDMENTS TO THE SPECIFICATION  
with two pages of amended specification.  
AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS  
with one page of amended claims.  
AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS  
with one page of drawing and amended Figure 9.  
AMENDMENTS TO THE ABSTRACT  
with one page of abstract.  
STATUS OF CLAIMS.

Respectfully submitted,

*Robert L. McKellar*

Robert L. McKellar  
Reg. No. 26,002  
(989) 631-4551



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of:

Michael John Watson

Serial Number 09/954,528

Filed: September 17, 2001

Title: IMPROVED ADHESIVES FOR  
SEMICONDUCTOR APPLICA-  
TIONS EFFICIENT PROCESSES  
FOR PRODUCING SUCH  
DEVICES AND THE DEVICE  
PER SE PRODUCED BY THE  
EFFICIENT PROCESSES

Attorney Docket: DC – 4952

Group Art Unit: 2827

Examiner: Chambliss

Remarks

April 28, 2003

Assistant Commissioner  
For Patents  
Washington DC 20231

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed on January 4, 2003, the applicant hereby requests consideration of this application on the basis of the following amendments and remarks.

The applicant has studied the Office Action and has amended the specification, including the title, the claims, abstract, and a drawing.

Turning to the details of the Office Action, the applicant notes that the information disclosure statement was timely filed and has been considered by the Examiner

The drawings have been objected-to by the Examiner on the basis that there appears to be a leader line without a numeral at the end. The applicant would suggest to the Examiner that upon examination of Figure 9, the applicant could not find such a line. It is possible that the Examiner thought that the letter "L" at the left of the moving arrow may have been a leader line without numeral. However, if the Examiner reviews page

13, line 12 to 14, he will find that the letter “L” refers to the moving arrow in the process outline. Applicant has inserted a leader line from the “L” to the moving arrow in Figure 9 for clarification and this objection appears to be overcome by such amendment.

Although not agreeing with the Examiner that such an amendment is required, the applicant has amended the ABSTRACT and a page showing that amendment is included herein.

The applicant has amended the TITLE according to the Examiner’s suggestion.

The Examiner has objected to claim 4 on the basis of improper dependency for failure to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant agrees, and has deleted claim 4 and substituted therefor new claim 15 with the proper dependency.

The deletion of claim 4 required the amendment of claim 7 and claim 7 was amended accordingly.

The Examiner has rejected claims 11 to 14 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph on the basis of the claims being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. More specifically, the Examiner alleges that claim 11 has an offending phrase, claim 12 has an offending phrase, claim 13 has an offending phrase, and claim 14 has an offending phrase and in addition, claim 14 “is claiming a desired result without the essential elements in the claims for yielding the claimed invention.

The applicant has amended claims 11 to 13.

With regard to claim 14, however, the applicant disagrees with the Examiner’s position on this claim. The claim is not a method claim, and therefore, there are no essential process steps missing from the claim. In addition, the phrase “insulating particles are present in an amount sufficient to obtain an adhesive with linear thermal expansion coefficient before and after any glass transition temperature of less than 240 micrometers/m/°C, between -55°C and +200°C when measured at a heating rate of 5°C/minute” is not a step in a method or process claim, it is a limitation in the claim that is a physical property limitation of the composition. Further, there is nothing in the law that states that the applicant has to limit the claim as the Examiner alleges. The applicant can claim a scope as broadly as he deems his invention to be, and unless the Examiner

can cite some prior art that creates a limitation, then the applicant is not required to limit the claim in that manner.

With regard to the above comments, it is believed that the claims 11 to 14 are in condition for allowance and the same is respectfully requested.

It is noted by the applicant that claims 1 to 10 have been allowed by the Examiner.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon has been examined by the applicant and does not consider any of the prior art to make the instant invention obvious or does not anticipate the instant invention.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Robert L. McKellar".

Robert L. McKellar

Reg. No. 26,002

(989) 631-4551